

1 **REMARKS**

2 Claim 95 is newly added. Claims 6, 12, 36, 46, 69, 74, 78, 80 and 88 are
3 amended. Claims 1, 8, 14-35 and 60-68 were previously cancelled without
4 prejudice. Claims 2-7, 9-13, 36-59 and 69-95 remain in the application for
5 consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests
6 reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

7
8 **Examiner Interview**

9 Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time spent on the
10 telephone discussing the disposition of this case. During the discussion, Applicant
11 and the Examiner discussed the cited art and some claim modifications that would
12 receive favorable treatment by the Examiner. While Applicant believes that such
13 modifications are unnecessary, in the spirit of advancing prosecution of this
14 matter, Applicant has made the clarifying amendments listed above and discussed
15 below.

16 If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance
17 of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call from
18 the Examiner.

19
20 **§ 103 Rejections**

21 Claims 2, 5-7, 9-11, 36-40, 43, 46-48, 50-54, 59, 80, 81, 84-89 and 92-94
22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No.
23 5,572,648 to Bibayan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,563,514 to Samar.

1 Claims 3-4, 12-13, 41-42, 45, 49, 56-57, 82-83 and 90-91 stand rejected
2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar and
3 further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,504 to Meyer et al. (hereinafter "Meyer").

4 Claim 58 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over
5 Bibayan in view of Samar and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,602,996 to
6 Powers et al. (hereinafter "Powers").

7 Claims 69-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious
8 over U.S. Patent No. 6,611,840 to Baer et al. (hereinafter "Baer") in view of
9 Meyer and in further view of Bibayan and still further in view of Samar.

10 Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over
11 Bibayan in view of Samar and in further view of Baer.

12 Claim 55 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over
13 Bibayan in view of Samar and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,637 to
14 Gayraud et al. (hereinafter "Gayraud").

15 16 The Claims

17 **Claim 6**, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a
18 software application program comprising [added language in bold-italics]:

- 19
- 20 • determining a user's context within an application program by
21 ascertaining a position of a user's cursor within a document provided
22 by the application program; and
 - 23 • automatically displaying at least one command on a display for the
24 user based on the user's context, wherein said automatically
25 displaying is accomplished, at least in part, using tree-based
visibility expressions, wherein individual expressions define
conditions associated with a user's interaction with the document
and which are used to ascertain when to display said at least one

1 command, *and wherein individual expressions are represented in a*
2 *tree data structure.*

3 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
4 matter is obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully
5 disagrees and continues to maintain that the Office has not established a *prima*
6 *facie* case of obviousness.

7 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
8 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual expressions are
9 represented in a tree data structure". Support for this amendment can be found,
10 among other places, on page 28 (line 14) of the subject application. None of the
11 references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any
12 such subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

13 **Claims 2-5, 7 and 9-11** depend from claim 6 and are allowable as
14 depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their
15 own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 6, are
16 neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record. In addition, to the
17 extent that claim 6 is allowable, the further rejection of claims 3-4 over Bibayan in
18 view of Samar and further in view of Meyer is not seen to add anything of
19 significance.

20 **Claim 12**, as amended, recites one or more computer-readable media
21 having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a
22 computer, cause the computer to [added language in bold-italics]:

- 23
- 24 • determine a user's context within an application program;
 - 25 • automatically display, independent of the user selecting any
 displayed menu item, at least one command on a display for the user

1 based on the user's context, said at least one command being
2 displayed in a modeless fashion in which the user can continue to
work within a document provided by the application program while
said at least one command is displayed; and

- 3 • automatically remove said at least one command from the user's
display responsive to a change in the user's context,
- 4 • wherein said automatically display and automatically remove are
accomplished, at least in part, using tree-based visibility expressions,
5 wherein individual expressions define conditions associated with a
user's interaction with the application and are used to ascertain when
6 to display said at least one command, *and wherein individual
expressions are represented in a tree data structure.*

8
9 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
10 matter is obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar and further in view of Meyer.
11 Applicant respectfully disagrees and continues to maintain that the Office has not
12 established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

13 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
14 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual expressions are
15 represented in a tree data structure". As noted above, none of the references cited
16 by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any such subject
17 matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

18 **Claim 13** depends from claim 12 and is allowable as depending from an
19 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features
20 which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are neither disclosed nor
21 suggested by the references of record.

22 **Claim 36**, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a
23 software application program comprising [added language in bold-italics]:

- 24 • determining a user's context within an application program by
25 evaluating at least portions of one or more expressions, each

1 expression being associated with a context block and defining a
2 condition that describes one or more aspects of a user's interaction
3 with the application program, wherein individual expressions
4 comprise tree-based visibility expressions, *and wherein individual
5 tree-based visibility expressions are represented in a tree data
6 structure*; and

- automatically displaying, independent of a user selecting any
displayed menu item, at least one context block on a display for the
user based on the user's context, individual context blocks
containing multiple commands that are possible selections for a user
based upon their context.

7
8 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
9 matter is obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully
10 disagrees and continues to maintain that the Office has not established a *prima*
11 *facie* case of obviousness.

12 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
13 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility
14 expressions are represented in a tree data structure". As noted above, none of the
15 references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any
16 such subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

17 **Claims 37-45** depend from claim 36 and are allowable as depending from
18 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
19 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 36, are neither disclosed
20 nor suggested by the references of record. In addition, to the extent that claim 36
21 is allowable, the further rejection of claims 41-42 and 45 over Bibayan in view of
22 Samar and further in view of Meyer is not seen to add anything of significance.
23 Finally, to the extent that claim 36 is allowable, the further rejection of claim 44
24
25

1 over Bibayan in view of Samar and further in view of Baer is not seen to add
2 anything of significance.

3 **Claim 46**, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a
4 software application program comprising [added language in bold-italics]:

- 5
- 6 • determining a user's context within an application program without
7 requiring the user to make a menu selection, wherein said determining is
8 accomplished, at least in part, using tree-based visibility expressions,
9 wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions define conditions
10 that describe a user's interactions with said application program, **and**
11 **wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are represented in**
12 **a tree data structure**;
- 13 • based on the user's context, displaying commands that are associated
14 with the context and which can assist the user in accomplishing a task;
15 and
- 16 • while the commands are being displayed, enabling the user to select and
17 apply various commands multiple times.

18
19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
20 matter is obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully
21 disagrees and continues to maintain that the Office has not established a *prima*
22 *facie* case of obviousness.

23 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
24 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility
25 expressions are represented in a tree data structure". As noted above, none of the
references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any
such subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 47-59 depend from claim 46 and are allowable as depending from
an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
features which, in combination with those recited in claim 46, are neither disclosed

1 nor suggested by the references of record. In addition, to the extent that claim 46
2 is allowable, the further rejection of claims 49 and 56-57 over Bibayan in view of
3 Samar and further in view of Meyer is not seen to add anything of significance.

4 Further, to the extent that claim 46 is allowable, the further rejection of
5 claim 55 over Bibayan in view of Samar and further in view of Gayraud is not
6 seen to add anything of significance. Finally, to the extent that claim 46 is
7 allowable, the further rejection of claim 58 over Bibayan in view of Samar and
8 further in view of Powers is not seen to add anything of significance.

9 **Claim 69**, as amended, recites a computing system comprising [added
10 language in bold-italics]:

- 11 • a single application program configured to provide:
- 12 • a single navigable window;
- 13 • multiple different functionalities to which the single navigable
14 window can be navigated by a user; and
- 15 • at least one context-sensitive command area that is associated with
16 the single navigable window, the single application program being
17 configured to automatically change command sets that are presented
18 to the user within the command area as the user navigates to
19 different functionalities, at least some commands of the command
20 sets being displayable independent of the user selecting any
21 displayed menu item and as a function of one or more tree-based
22 visibility expressions that define conditions that describe a user's
23 interactions with the single application program, *wherein individual
24 tree-based visibility expressions are represented in a tree data
25 structure.*

22 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
23 matter is obvious over Baer in view of Meyer and in further view of Bibayan and
24 still further in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully disagrees and continues to
25 maintain that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

1 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
2 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility
3 expressions are represented in a tree data structure". As noted above, none of the
4 references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any
5 such subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

6 **Claims 70-73** depend from claim 69 and are allowable as depending from
7 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
8 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 69, are neither disclosed
9 nor suggested by the references of record.

10 **Claim 74**, as amended, recites a computing system comprising [added
11 language in bold-italics]:

- 12
- 13 • a single application program configured to:
- 14 • display a single navigable window for a user to use in navigating
15 between multiple different functionalities that can be provided by the
16 single application program;
- 17 • provide at least one context-sensitive command area that is
18 associated with the single navigable window, the single application
19 program automatically changing command sets that are presented to
20 the user within the command area as the user navigates to different
21 functionalities, at least some commands of the command sets being
22 displayable independent of the user selecting any displayed menu
23 item and as a function of one or more tree-based visibility
24 expressions that define conditions that describe a user's interactions
25 with the single application program, *wherein individual tree-based
visibility expressions are represented in a tree data structure*; and
- incorporate different functionalities in an extensible manner so that
the user can use the single navigable window to navigate to the
different incorporated functionalities.

24 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
25 matter is obvious over Baer in view of Meyer and in further view of Bibayan and

1 still further in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully disagrees and continues to
2 maintain that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

3 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
4 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility
5 expressions are represented in a tree data structure". As noted above, none of the
6 references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any
7 such subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

8 **Claims 75-77** depend from claim 74 and are allowable as depending from
9 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
10 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 74, are neither disclosed
11 nor suggested by the references of record.

12 **Claim 78**, as amended, recites a computing method comprising [added
13 language in bold-italics]:

- 14
- 15 • displaying a user interface that comprises a single navigable window
16 that can be navigated between multiple different functionalities that
17 are provided by a single application program;
- 18 • receiving user input that indicates selection of a particular
19 functionality;
- 20 • responsive to receiving said user input, navigating the single
21 navigable window to the particular selected functionality and
22 displaying in said window indicia of said functionality that can
23 enable a user to accomplish a task associated with the particular
24 selected functionality;
- 25 • determining a user's context within the selected functionality using
one or more tree-based visibility expressions, wherein individual
expressions define conditions associated with a user's interaction
with said selected functionality, **and wherein individual tree-based
visibility expressions are represented in a tree data structure**; and
- automatically displaying at least one command for the user based on
the user's context independent of the user selecting any displayed
menu item.

1
2 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
3 matter is obvious over Baer in view of Meyer and in further view of Bibayan and
4 still further in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully disagrees and continues to
5 maintain that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

6 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
7 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that “individual tree-based visibility
8 expressions are represented in a tree data structure”. As noted above, none of the
9 references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any
10 such subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

11 **Claim 79** depends from claim 78 and is allowable as depending from an
12 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features
13 which, in combination with those recited in claim 78, are neither disclosed nor
14 suggested by the references of record.

15 **Claim 80**, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a
16 software application program comprising [added language in bold-italics]:

- 17
- 18 • determining a user’s context within an application program by
19 ascertaining a user’s selection within a document provided by the
20 application program and by using one or more tree-based visibility
21 expressions, wherein individual expressions define conditions
22 associated with a user’s interaction with said document, ***and***
wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are represented
in a tree data structure; and
 - 23 • automatically displaying at least one command on a display for the
24 user based on the user’s context.
- 25

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
2 matter is obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully
3 disagrees and continues to maintain that the Office has not established a *prima*
4 *facie* case of obviousness.

5 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
6 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility
7 expressions are represented in a tree data structure". As noted above, none of the
8 references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any
9 such subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

10 **Claims 81-87** depend from claim 80 and are allowable as depending from
11 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
12 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 80, are neither disclosed
13 nor suggested by the references of record. In addition, to the extent that claim 80
14 is allowable, the further rejection of claims 82-83 over Bibayan in view of Samar
15 and further in view of Meyer is not seen to add anything of significance.

16 **Claim 88**, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a
17 software application program comprising [added language in bold-italics]:

- 18
- 19 • determining a user's context within an application program using, at
20 least in part, one or more tree-based visibility expressions, wherein
21 individual expressions define conditions associated with a user's
22 interaction with the application program, ***and wherein individual***
23 ***expressions are represented in a tree data structure***; and
 - 24 • automatically displaying at least one command on a display for the
25 user based on the user's context, independent of a user selecting any
displayed menu item.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
2 matter is obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar. Applicant respectfully
3 disagrees and continues to maintain that the Office has not established a *prima*
4 *facie* case of obviousness.

5 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
6 Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "wherein individual expressions
7 are represented in a tree data structure". As noted above, none of the references
8 cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan, disclose or suggest any such
9 subject matter. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

10
11 **Conclusion**

12 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant
13 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next
14 anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,
15 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call from the Examiner. Applicant has
16 earnestly attempted to advance prosecution in this matter. If the next Office
17 Action does not include allowable subject matter, Applicant intends to file a
18 Notice of Appeal.

19
20 Respectfully Submitted,

21
22 Dated: 09/01/2006

23 By: 

24 Rick Bucher
25 Reg. No. 57,971
(509) 324-9256